

REMARKS

The Office action of June 1, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully noted.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 13, and 17-19 have been amended.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. ("Lee") (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,553). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request allowance thereof in the continuation prosecution application for the following reasons.

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

Claims 1-19 are not anticipated by Lee

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under § 102(e) in view of Lee. Lee fails to disclose the recited features as amended such as an information history list display section for displaying communication history in connection with answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications based on history related information which is generated by outgoing or incoming communication and indicates the answering state of the respective communications.

In contrast, in the only relevant embodiment (FIG. 36), Lee solely discloses displaying communication history in connection with an answering state for completed answers. Lee discloses

displaying the communication history for a sender of an auto-response message to register the voting answers from recipients (see FIG. 36; col. 38, lines 47-53). Specifically, Lee states that "...when the sender opens the sent mail copy of the autoresponse message, he views a list of the recipients 3605, their responses 3610, the time 3615 each response was received, and a current tally 3620 of the vote results such as is illustrated in FIG. 36 (see FIG. 36; col. 38, lines 49-53).

Lee only displays the communication history associated with recipients providing a completed answer (voting response) to the voting email message which is significantly different from displaying communication history in connection with answering state whether answer has been completed or not as recited. Simply put, if a recipient of the voting message in Lee does not respond, there will be no display of this communication history as only completed voting responses (completed answers) from recipients are shown in FIG. 36 to indicate answering state in contrast to the recited feature which displays communication history indicating answering state whether answers have been completed or not.

Further, in the portions of Lee which do display communication history associated with status of follow-up action, manual input is required by the user to display the communication history indicating the completed or uncompleted answering state in contrast to indication of the answering state being generated by outgoing or incoming communication as recited. Specifically, Lee states that

"...the present invention also provides a method for displaying the status of a follow-up action associated with the message item...an email recipient may work through his or her inbox and flag messages that require some form of follow-up action...once the follow-up action is complete, the recipient may mark the message to so indicate the completed state." (see FIGs. 11-18; col. 5, lines 49-51; col. 20, lines 66-67; col. 21, lines 1-5).

Lee requires manual input (message flag input by user) by the user to display communication history to indicate answering state for completed or uncompleted answers which is significantly different from indication of the answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, being generated from outgoing or incoming communication as recited.

Lee fails to disclose an information history list display section for displaying communication history in connection with answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications based on history related information which is generated by outgoing or incoming communication and indicates the answering state of the respective communications as recited making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the remaining claims are

allowable and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH, & BIRCH, LLP

BY

 4/10/35

Michael R. Cammarata, Reg.#39,491

MRC/CAG:tm
1163-0341P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
Phone: (703) 205-8000